

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

Replacement Figure 1 is attached and is now labeled as PRIOR ART and is now believed to be in compliance with the requirements of the Office Action.

**Remarks:**

Applicants have carefully reviewed the Office Action of June 22, 2007. Claims 1-20 have been amended.

The Office Action indicated that Figure 1 should be designated as "Prior Art." A new Figure 1 is being submitted herewith designated as "Prior Art" as required by the Office Action.

Claims 1-20 were objected to for informalities. In addition, claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite. Editorial modifications have been made to claims 1 to 20 to overcome all of the indefiniteness issues raised in the Office Action.

Independent claims 1 and 11 have further been amended and more clearly distinguish over the prior art.

Claims 1 to 5, 7 to 15 and 17 to 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by MAGID et al. (U.S. patent no. 5,764,873).

MAGID does teach detecting a user action of dragging one or more objects from an external source over a display using a mouse. However, contrary to the assertion in the Office Action, MAGID does not teach displaying a drag set of icons attached to the mouse course, does not teach detecting the user's intention to draw one object from the list, among other differences, which will appear when considering the following remarks.

MAGID acknowledges prior art that enables a user to select a plurality of objects and drag them to a new location, for example by control-clicking on multiple objects and then starting a drag. Therefore, the notion of a 'drag set', defined as a logical list of dragged entities, is acknowledged by MAGID as a pre-existing concept. MAGID's contribution is enabling the

user to assemble one \*or many\* drag sets, and to do so with minimal keyboard intervention: MAGID describes picking up objects (adding them to the drag sets) but does not describe the visualization of the data set or a method for iteratively dropping multiple components in any detail.

- Paragraph 8 of the Office Action contends that MAGID teaches displaying a set of icons attached to the mouse [cursor] representing all of said dragged objects, referring to col. 6 lines 49-56. Applicants disagree with this reading.
- Col 6 lines 49-56 recites “If the selected object is a group of objects, all the objects from the selected set are added to the drag set. In the illustrative prior art embodiment, the selected icon is movably linked to the mouse pointer and moves either with the mouse pointer or in place of the mouse pointer”.
- However:
  - ‘The drag set’ is an abstract list of items, not a graphical representation of that set [col 7, line 59]. When multiple objects are selected, MAGID teaches that the items are all added to the [logical] drag set – not that they are drawn attached to the cursor.
  - In this section, MAGID notes that in prior art the icon (that graphical object that the user clicked on) is attached to the cursor. This is not a description of the current invention, but prior art.
  - The invention is silent on how the drag set is displayed. Claim 1 recites “an image representing a composite one or more of said

drag sets”, but this does not indicate that 10 images are displayed as 10 icons attached to the cursor; all that it specifies is that if there are multiple [logical] drag sets being dragged, than an image depicting the drag sets will be displayed. A completely abstract representation, such as the number “1”, would satisfy the display of drag set 1.

- From this close review of MAGID, it is evident that the Office Action is not correct:
  - Col 6 lines 49-56 do not teach a set of icons attached to the cursor; Moreover, it does not teach any graphical representation.
  - Comparing this reference with Claim 1 we learn that at best, the reference teaches attaching to the cursor a single graphical image representing the sum of all active drag sets.
- Paragraph 8 of the Office Action further contends that MAGID teaches detecting the user’s intention to drop an object and processing the dropping of the first object in the dragged set of icons (“list of attached objects”)( col 9 lines 11-12, 23-30).
  - Applicants can find no support for this assertion in the referenced paragraphs.
  - Col 9 lines 11-12 and 23-30 state:

- At decision block 540, operating system 37 checks whether the user, having initiated a drop command at decision block 535, has requested options from a conditional cascade menu.
- At block 565, a determination is made of the status of the window below the mouse pointer. Continuing with decision block 570, if a 'no drop' status has been returned in block 565, the YES is taken to block 580 where the lazy drag function is ended. Otherwise, the lazy drag function is completed at block 575 where the lazy drag set information is exchanged with the target window by updating second in-memory model 42.
- The characterization of MAGID is incorrect: looking at figures 5a and 5b, we see that there is no control path which allows the user to drop more than one time; the 'drop command', block 535, is not within a loop (as, for example, block 525 is) – **thus according to MAGID, the user can \*pick up\* multiple objects, but only drop once.** Thus the user cannot separately drop multiple objects without initiating multiple pick up / drop cycles.
- Paragraph 8 of the Office Action further contends that MAGID teaches the drag set of icons ("visual representations") to be attached to the mouse until the user exits from the drag and drop operation (see col. 6 lines 49-56, col. 7 lines 14-20).
- Applicants can find no support for this contention in the referenced paragraphs:

- “If the selected object is a group of objects, all the objects from the selected set are added to the drag set. In the illustrative prior art embodiment, the selected icon is movably linked to the mouse pointer and moves either with the mouse pointer or in place of the mouse pointer.”
- “If the determined status is that of ‘no drop’, or otherwise a condition preventing the being moved object from being moved or dropped, operating system 37 exits the move function at block 475. Otherwise, the ‘move’ function is completed at block 470 where the source and target windows exchange data information by updating second in-memory model 42.
- The drag set is a logical list of items, not an on-screen visualization. MAGID invokes prior art, which involves drawing an (apparently single) icon attached to the cursor. The present invention supersedes prior art by drawing one icon per object in the Applicants' equivalent of a drag set, and enabling the user to drop one item at a time from that drag set.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that MAGID cannot anticipate claims 1 and 11 and the claims depending thereon.

Claims 6 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over MAGID in view of RYZHOV. Claims 1 and 11 are allowable as discussed above. RYZHOV fails to overcome the deficiencies of MAGID. Applicants therefore assert that claims 1 and 11 patentably distinguish over the combination of MAGID and RYZHOV and claims 6 and 16 also patentably distinguish over the prior art. Applicants request that the rejections be withdrawn.


A speedy and favorable action in the form of a Notice of Allowance is hereby solicited.  
If the Examiner feels that a telephone interview may be helpful in this matter, please contact  
Applicant's representative at (612) 336-4728.



Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

Dated: 12/21/07

By:   
Gregory A. Sebold  
Reg. No. 33,280  
GAS/km